

In the
Indiana Supreme Court



In the Matter of: Breanne Joy Strubinger,
Respondent

Supreme Court Case No.
49S00-1701-DI-11

Published Order Revoking Probation and Imposing Suspension

On October 5, 2017, the Court entered an order suspending Respondent from the practice of law for a period of 180 days, with 90 days actively served and the remainder stayed subject to completion of at least 24 months of probation with monitoring by the Judges and Lawyers Assistance Program (JLAP). The order stated: “If Respondent violates the terms of her probation, the stay of her suspension may be vacated and the stayed suspension may be actively served without automatic reinstatement.”

On July 18, 2018, the Commission filed a verified motion to revoke Respondent’s probation, pursuant to Admission and Discipline Rule 23(16)(c), asserting Respondent violated the conditions of probation by virtue of her termination from JLAP due to her noncompliance with her monitoring agreement. Respondent filed no response. Her failure to file an answer to the Commission’s motion is deemed to be an admission to the Commission’s averments. *See* Admis. Disc. R. 23(16)(c)(2).

Being duly advised, the Court GRANTS the motion and revokes Respondent’s probation. **Respondent shall be suspended from the practice of law for a period of not less than 90 days, without automatic reinstatement, effective immediately.** Respondent already is under a suspension order for continuing legal education noncompliance and dues nonpayment. Respondent is ordered to fulfill the continuing duties of a suspended attorney under Admission and Discipline Rule 23(26). At the conclusion of the minimum period of suspension, Respondent may petition this Court for reinstatement to the practice of law in this state, provided Respondent pays the costs of this proceeding, fulfills the duties of a suspended attorney, and satisfies the requirements for reinstatement of Admission and Discipline Rule 23(18). Reinstatement is discretionary and requires clear and convincing evidence of the attorney’s remorse, rehabilitation, and fitness to practice law. *See* Admis. Disc. R. 23(18)(b).

The costs of this proceeding are assessed against Respondent.

Done at Indianapolis, Indiana, on 8/30/2018.

Loretta H. Rush
Chief Justice of Indiana

All Justices concur.